

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

WARREN E. BELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-0387-JCC-TLF

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's objection (Dkt. No. 70) to the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (Dkt. No. 69) of the Honorable Theresa L. Fricke, United States Magistrate Judge, recommending this Court GRANT Defendants' summary judgement motion, (Dkt. No. 39), DENY Plaintiff's summary judgement motion, (Dkt. No. 19), and DISMISS all Plaintiff's claims with prejudice. Having thoroughly considered Plaintiff's objections and the relevant record, the Court hereby OVERRULES the objections, ADOPTS the R&R, and DISMISSES the case with prejudice, for the reasons explained herein.

The facts of this case are outlined in Judge Fricke's R&R and the Court will not repeat them here. (Dkt. No. 69 at 2-4.) Judge Fricke found that when the facts are viewed in a light most favorable to the Plaintiff, they do not show that the Plaintiff is entitled to relief. (*Id.* at 7-26.) Plaintiff's objections to the R&R do not trigger this Court's review, because they are

conclusory, and summaries of arguments previously presented.¹

Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS:

- (1) Plaintiff's objections (Dkt. No. 70) are OVERRULED.
- (2) The R&R (Dkt. No. 69) is APPROVED and ADOPTED.
- (3) Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgement (Dkt. No. 39) is GRANTED.
- (4) Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgement (Dkt. No. 19) is DENIED.
- (5) Plaintiff's complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is DISMISSED with prejudice.
- (6) The Clerk is DIRECTED to administratively CLOSE this matter and send copies of this order to Plaintiff and to Judge Fricke.

DATED this 10th day of May 2023.



John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ A district reviews *de novo* those portions of a magistrate judge's R&R to which a party properly objects. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A party properly objects when they file "specific written objections" to the R&R as required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2). Objections are required to enable the court to "focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties' dispute." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). The court is not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Id.* at 149. Said another way, for an objection to be proper, it must point to specific error contained within the R&R. *See, e.g., United States v. Diaz-Lemus*, 2010 WL 2573748, slip op. at 1 (D. Ariz. 2010); *see Djelassi v. ICE Field Office Director*, 434 F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (W.D. Wash. 2020).